

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

	T		T		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/675,566	09/30/2003	Gordon Y. Li	81373818US01-02CXT0070E	9980	
94518 7550 08/11/2010 DLA PIPER LLP (US) 2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE			EXAMINER		
			HOSSAIN, TANIM M		
EAST PALO	ALTO, CA 94303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2445		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/11/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/675,566	LI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Tanim Hossain	2445		

	Tanim Hossain	2445					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.131; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(00/->					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period or extension and the corresponding amount of the fee appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		. ,	•				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		I be entered and an e	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-16.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after en	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Brooks' abstract, for example, discloses bifurcated processing architecture. The first processor processes information flowing to and from cable media interface (cruitty. This constitutes the data networking engine, which performs the interacting with equipment, as claimed. The second processor performs the management of some message processing and scheduling, which constitutes cable modern functions other than those of the data networking engine (please see paragraph 0026). This then constitutes the cable modern engine, as claimed. Claim 3 of the Brooks reference further teaches partitioned processors, where the co-processor supports the processing of cable media and performs data transfer, and the first processor performs a plurality of other processing functions.

The 112 rejections are hereby withdrawn.

Finality of the previous office action is proper, given that the cited paragraphs point to the birfurcated nature of the cable modem, where each of the processors perform different functions. This is sufficient to equate the corresponding processor to the data networking engine (the processor that handles the data flow), and the other to the cable modem engine (the processor that performs other functions).